UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,991	09/07/2006	Yasushi Noguchi	129357	6419
27049 OLIFF & BERI	7590 08/13/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	50	KEMMERLE III, RUSSELL J		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27049@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/591,991	NOGUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
RUSSELL J. KEMMERLE III	1791		

	RUSSELL J. KEMMERLE III	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(iii)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria mally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was appeared. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3.	out prior to the data of filing a bring	will not be entered be	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO ⁻ w);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	the rejection of claims 13-20 unde	r 35 USC 112, second	<u>paragraph</u> .
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 13-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Jason L Lazorcik/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1791	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that currently claimed pressure range is based on a balance between deaarating the clay as well as preventing microcapsule damage. This is not found persuasive because Applicants have presented only broad assertions that such an optamization of the combined teachings would not result in the currently claimed pressure range. The pressure is a known result effective variable (as previously discussed) and could easily be optamized by one skilled in the art to result in a final product having the best properties. It is not necessary that one skilled in the art have the same motivating factors as Applicants (the balancing mentioned above), as long as there is a motivating factor to optimize the pressure (removing gas).

Applicants next argue that Table 2 of the specification sufficiently shows the criticality of the currently claimed pressure range with 4 data points in the claimed range and 1 data point below the claimed range.

This is not found to be persuasive. The scope of the current claims is significantly broader than what can be resonably said to be shown by Table 2. The examples listed in Table 2 are limited to a very specific set of properties (in terms of composition, particle size, circularity, porosity, etc) while the method of claim 1 is not restricted such conditions. Further, even for the specific examples given, the reduced pressure is only shown at levels inside the claimed range, and at a presser far below the claimed range. It is not shown that anything is critical about the range recited by showing a failure to work at pressures close to or above the currently claimed range. Additionally, it is unclear what results Applicants allege to be unexpected. The only result noted is that example 12 is non-formable while examples 8-11 are formable. Since the prior art does result in a formable structure it is not clear how this could be considered unexpected.